

To Whom It May Concern:

I am non-executive Chairman of the Board of a NASDAQ-listed public company, Chairman of a privately-held company, and a Director of another private company and a NASDAQ-listed publicly-held company. Thus, I utilize the airlines quite extensively, for my work. I am also very familiar with aviation having been an active instrument-rated private pilot for approximately 15 years. I recently became aware of the rule which mandates the retirement of airline pilots at age 60. I would like to register my concern that this regulation appears to defy common sense and logic when it comes to aviation safety. Just because a pilot reaches the age of 60 does not mean that such a person is incapable of being a safe pilot. On the contrary, I would argue that people with these years of experience bring to the cockpit additional years of judgment, maturity, and safety. It makes sense that pilots of any age should be regularly evaluated for their medical status. Ironically, pilots who have various medical conditions can obtain exemptions which enables them to continue flying; however, just because an individual has reached 60, despite a clean bill of health, can lead to the person's mandatory retirement. I find this an example of where lobbying from individuals within airline pilot unions have prevailed upon the FAA to favor younger members at the expense of older, more experienced members. I trust that this rule will be re-evaluated, and that the FAA not succumb to egregiously unfair special interest lobbying. I frankly would much prefer a highly qualified 60+ year old captain flying my commercial airliner than a 30-40 year old pilot who may have less experience, and perhaps other risk factors more problematic than age.

Very Truly Yours,

David I. Scheer